



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,991	03/06/2007	Victor A. Raul	DOC 0170 PA	5824
23368	7590	07/27/2010	EXAMINER	
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP			PIHONAK, SARAH	
FIFTH THIRD CENTER, ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1300				
DAYTON, OH 45402-2023			1627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/27/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/576,991 <b>Examiner</b> SARAH PIHONAK	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAUL ET AL. <b>Art Unit</b> 1627
---	--	---

**–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –**

THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  
 NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-7-9-12 and 14-18.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8,13 and 19-41.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 5/26/2010  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627

Applicants' arguments, filed on 7/6/2010, have been fully considered but do not place the application in condition for allowance. The Applicants have argued that the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14-18 should be withdrawn, as the claims are directed to a composition which excludes lipophilic solvents, while Kosal et. al. teaches the presence of a volatile solvent, including silicone fluids. The Applicants have asserted as Kosal is silent as to exclusion of lipophilic solvents, Kosal et. al. does not render the claims obvious. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Kosal et. al. teaches an oil-in-water emulsion composition comprised of a pressure sensitive adhesive, a surfactant, and a thickening agent, in which the pressure sensitive is comprised of a cross-linking reaction between a hydroxyl terminated polydiorganosiloxane and a silanol containing silicone resin. Kosal et. al. teaches the presence of silicone fluids, the claims exclude only lipophilic solvents. As discussed in the office action dated 5/10/2010, there exists a variety of silicone fluids, including lipophilic and non-lipophilic types. As Kosal et. al. teaches broadly silicone fluids, and not exclusively lipophilic solvents, the claims would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention. The rejection under 35 USC 103(a) was proper and is maintained, for reasons of record.